

Appl. No. 10/626,269
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2005

Remarks

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18, 19, and 22-24 are currently pending. Claims 4, 6, 15, 17, 20, and 21 have been cancelled in this Reply, while claim 8 was previously cancelled. New claims 22-25, dependent from claim 7 and similar in form and content to existing claims 9-12 have been added.

The claim amendments have been made in order to expedite allowance of the claims.

Applicant's representative appreciates the Examiner's courtesy in granting a telephonic interview to discuss the pending claims and the outstanding rejections on Tuesday, July 26, 2005.

Applicant also very much appreciates the Examiner's indication on page 4 of the Office Action mailed May 4, 2005, that claims 6, 7, and 17 would be allowable if the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections were overcome, and if these dependent claims were amended to incorporate the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

Applicants have done as the Examiner has suggested. In order to keep the number of amendments to a minimum and to make use of the existing dependent claims, the limitations of former claim 6 and former claims 4 and 1, from which claim 6 depended, have all been combined into newly amended claim 1. Previously existing dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 9-12 have been retained; claim 5 was amended to correct the dependency following these amendments. Claims 4 and 6 were cancelled since these limitations are now part of the base claim.

Appl. No. 10/626,269
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2005

Similarly, the Examiner indicated that claim 17 would be allowable if its limitations were combined with those of the base claim (claim 13). This has been done by canceling claim 17 and incorporating its limitations into claim 13. Previously pending dependent claims 14, 16, 18 and 19 have been retained.

Finally, claim 7 was amended to incorporate the limitations of its base claim, claim 1. New dependent claims 22-25 mirror dependent existing claim 9-12.

The Applicant has made these claim amendments in accordance with the Examiner's indication that claim 6, 7, and 17 were allowable base claims. Applicant in no way waives the right to pursuant any of the now cancelled subject matter present in the original, unamended claims, or in earlier amended claims in a further continuation or divisional application.

Rejection Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 and 9-19 as being allegedly indefinite. The Examiner pointed out that the use of the term "a front edge" (line 10) and "a back edge" (line 12) in claim 1, and similarly in claim 13 constituted a double recital of elements. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to indicated "the front edge" and "the back edge" in the indicated locations, and believe this amendment should make the claims definite. If Applicants have misconstrued or misunderstood the Examiner's comment, the Examiner is asked to kindly telephone the Applicant's representative so that this rejection may be addressed.

Appl. No. 10/626,269
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2005

Conclusion

The Applicant has amended the claims to conform with the Examiner's helpful suggestions and to expedite allowance of the presently claimed aspect of the invention. Applicant thus believes that the claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully asks that the Examiner issue a Notice to that effect.

Should any matters remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number given below. While no fees are thought due in connection with this Reply, if the Applicants are in error in this regard kindly

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

8/1/05



Carlos A. Fisher
Reg. No. 36, 510
4 Venture, Suite 300
Irvine, California 92618
(949) 450-1750
(949) 450-1764 Facsimile